

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 in amended form remain in the application for consideration.

The claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Katzman et al. (3,282,478) and Roe (3,645,070).

New claim 10 defines the air filtration apparatus as including a vertical tube that is rotated about a vertical axis to draw water through a lower inlet end, and to discharge the water to form a spray in the path of motion of air containing wettable pollutants. The pollutants become wet and remain in the chamber as they separate from the air. The wettable pollutants drip into the body of water, the cleaner air passes to the air outlet.

Katzman provides a vertically supported tube having a lower inlet end disposed in the water and an outlet through openings 112 on the under side of a disk 78. The water passes horizontally along the under surface of the disk and then through slot 96 where it mixes with the air received through the inlet opening to form a mist that passes through the slot and toward the air outlet where the droplets are directed against vane 24 and then passed downwardly into the chamber to mix with the fluid contained therein. The finely divided mist passes upwardly into the wind tunnel as humidified air.

Katzman does not teach of a tube having an opening which discharges a mist or spray directly into the incoming air to form a mixture. This is an entirely different and less efficient method for using a mist from that taught by Applicant.

Applicant: Ronald D. Stead
Serial No.: 10/727,382

The reason is that Katzman is humidifying the air. Applicant is cleaning the air. The mist and the pollutants remain in the pollution-collecting chamber as they fall into the body of water.


The claims were also rejected as being anticipated by Roe. Roe uses pipettes 52 for spraying water into air passing through the chamber, to humidify the air.

Roe also fails to teach of an opening for discharging the water into air passing upwardly along the tube from the inlet toward the outlet.

Both Katzman and Roe teach of humidifiers for adding water into the environmental air. Neither of them suggests an air cleaner in which water is introduced into the air to remove wettable pollutants, which remain in the pollution-collecting chamber.

Accordingly, it is believed that claims 9 and 10 are in condition for allowance and such action is requested. The remaining claims depend from new claim 10 and are also therefore believed to be allowable.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles W. Chandler
P.O. Reg. No. 24,290
Attorney for Applicant
33150 Schoolcraft
Livonia, MI 48150


Dated: 8/23/05

Applicant: Ronald D. Stead
Serial No.: 10/727,382



CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8 (a)

I hereby certify that the foregoing Response is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on August 24, 2005



Charles W. Chandler
Attorney for Applicant